G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1907

(Madurai)

File No. 90-1907

Serial Nos. 1 to 8

Papers Filed.

Month December 1908

SUBJECT.

Appeal Petition of Krishnaiah of Tirchattiputtur Taluk appealing against the Deputy Commr's order depriving him of the Post of the archak of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple & praying for his restoration.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES
	Mis 7. 189-08

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No. 90-07

SUBJECT.

In re the Archakship of the Sri Ranganatha Swamy Temple at Thoreahalli, Gubbi Taluk

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements

No. 125 dated 21st April 1908

The temple of Sri Ranganatha Swamy at Thoreahalli in the Gubbi Taluk is a muzrai institution endowed with Inam lands

(Slip A) Krishnaiah of Yoreahalli village appealed to Govt against the order of the Dy Commissioner, Tumkur District, regarding the Archakship of the said temple The appeal petition was forwarded to the Dy Commr, Tumkur District, and that officer has submitted his report thereon together

File No. of Muzrai Secretariat.

with the records of enquiry

The facts of the case are as under —

A building site Khanesmari no 14 is reported to be in the khata of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Gorehalli besides certain Inam lands In September 1905, one Kunnaiah applied To (Slip B
the Taluk Amildar for permission to build a house on this site The Shanbhogue having reported that the site belonged to the temple and that Kunniah was the Hakdar Pujari thereof, and the villagers also having drawn up a mahazar To the above effect, per (Slip C
mission prayed for was granted to Kunniah When Kunniah began to build the house, the appellant Krishnaiah complained that the site belonged to the temple, that he was (Slip D
the Archak thereof and enjoyed the temple Inam lands together with the site in question and prayed that Kunniah should not be permitted To build the house on the site. —

GPB--1,000—11-6-03

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 96 of 1907

Thus the question became one of rank to the archakship between Kunniah and Krishniah

Kunniah deposes that about 5 or 6 years ago he left the village temporarily on some private business (SLIP E) that he was kept up with (ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದ) for 4 or 5 years, that at the time of his leaving the village he had appointed his uncle Venkatarangiah as archak for him that Venkatarangiah did puja work for 2 years and being found unfit for the post, one Srinivasiah was again appointed by Kannah boss and that after Srinivasiah's death, Krishniah became the temporary archak of the temple. He further states that he returned to Shorachalli in 1905, that with the permission

help given by the villagers to build a house on the temple site on the grounds that he was the Archak of the temple, he began to build one for his own habitation, that the temple lands were in his enjoyment while he was performing the Archak duty and subsequently during his temporary absence, the Inam lands were in the enjoyment of others that did Archak duty and that the Inam Title-deed relating to the temple lands which was with his father and uncle when they performed the duty, was not given to him by them.

The Patel, Shanbhogue and Villagers have also given Kyphiyaths supporting Kunniah's Statement.

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. 90 of 1907
	Kunniah has produced the following documents in support of his claim to the Puja Hak :—
(Slip F)	1) Receipt granted to Shanbhogue Narasappa by Kunniah's uncle Venkatiah and father Rangiah in 1841 when the Inam Title-deeds was given to them by him.
(Slip G)	(2) Receipt granted to Kunniah by the Patel in 1881 when the produce of the Inam lands was placed in the latter's custody when Kunniah failed to pay arrears of Jodi due on the Inam lands.
(Slip H)	(3) Notice dated 29 : 3 : 1895 to Kunniah from the Taluk office for production of certain papers wherein he is addressed as the temple "Vicharane Karta".

(4) A document executed by Kunniah on 23.6.1891 wherein he is spoken as the Archak of the temple (Slip 9)

(5) A chit granted by Kunniah to Valavar on 21.5.1894 as a valuable security for a loan of Rs 12 3/4 taken by the former with a view to pay the Jodi amount due on the temple Inam lands. (Slip 9)

(6) Another document executed by Kunniah wherein Kunniah is spoken of as the Archak of the temple. (Slip

It is reported that all the foregoing will show that Kunniah's father and uncle and after them Kunniah himself were performing the Archak duty since 1841

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 90 of 1907

and prior thereto

Krishnaiah's statement runs to the following effect —

(Slip 2) About 35 years ago his father Thimmenkatiah and his grand-father Yetirajiah were offering Puje in the temple owing to some ill-feelings that existed between his fathers and the villagers, the former ceased to perform Archak service in the temple 30 years ago. Thereupon the village people appointed one Tirumaliah for doing temple worship. For about 20 years thereafter, Venkatiah Kunniah's uncle and Kunniah did the work. The people of the village sent for him (Krishnaiah) and gave him the Puje work which he has been performing for the last 50

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

The documents produced by Krishniah are as follow —

(1) The Receipt Patta book in support of quit-rent due on the Inam lands. This documents shows that Krishniah paid Jodi for the years 1902-3, 1903-4 and 1904-5. (Slip m)

2. An Agreement executed in favor of Krishniah by Range Gowda and others of Thorekalli making over the temple worship To Krishniah. (Slip N)

It is remarked in the Assistant Collector's Memo that this document not valid inasmuch as the people have no business to appoint the Archak of a Muzrai institution and that this ~~process~~ procedure is contrary To Govt. order of the 19th June 1906 (Vide Page 11).

Patel Range Gowda and the Shanbhogue depose that this document was not (Slip 6)

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 9 - of 190

brought to their knowledge and that it is signed by people of neighbouring villagers.

(3) A letter purporting to have been written on 10. 3. 1895 by Range Gowda to Ramanujiah, brother of Krishniah asking him to return to Thorehalli and take over the archakship of the temple which had vested in his family.

(Exh P)

It is observed in the S.I. Office remarks that from the above it will be seen that Krishniah has been worshipping the deity since 1902-3 and has adduced no evidence to prove that his forefathers ever did the puja work in the temple, and that Krishniah's statement that his father and grand-father were worshipping the

6//

10//

35 years ago loses significance in the face of the fact that Kunniah's father and uncle were doing the archak work in 1891

The Officer in charge of the Gubbi Sub-Division while admitting Kunniah as hakdar Archak, directed Kunniah to produce further documentary evidence if any to prove his hak to the Range Office and that pending disposal of the question of hak, Krishniah who was then worshipping the deity should continue to do so. (Slip 2)

It is also reported that Krishniah left the village and did not turn up for a long and produced no documents. in doing.

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 90 of 190)

worship in the temple. the Dy Asstt Commr of Tiruvellore has directed Kunniah to do Puja work

(Paper under disposal) Slip R

The Dy Commr has ordered that Krishniah and his family have not had the Archakship for a long time, that during that period it was in Kunniah's family - adversely to Krishniah, that - although Krishniah stepped into it in 1902-03 he left it subsequently and Kunniah is again in the post and that there is no reason to disturb - Kunniah.

Krishniah has appealed to Court against the foregoing orders praying for his restoration to the Archakship in question.

Submitted.

11/5/08

W 11/5708

12

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

In Govt order of the 19th June 1904 referred to in Page 8 of the office-note, it is remarked that "the temple of Saptamatrukas being a muzrai instn, it was irregular on the part of the Amildar to have allowed the villagers to appoint their own Pujaries without any reference to him. Such appointments should in future invariably receive confirmation by the Dy. Commr". (Vide linked file) (Slip 11)

submitted)

Muzrai Secretary's remarks:-

This is a case of Pujari right and has to be decided by a regular suit on the Muzrai side. Kamiah is now in possession of the Pujarishipand it is for the other party Krishniah to file such regular suit to establish his claim if any. The Petr Krishnaiya may be informed

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat File No. 20 of 1907

according and copy communicated
to the Rg Commr :

470
12.5.08
Sd (illegible) to the 2nd Committee

Sd/- Chandrasekhara Iyer
12-5-08.

approved
Sd/- M
12/5/08

Draft Yk 12/5/08

Draft
Fair copy
Issued
Sd/-

Issue Yk 20/5/08

14

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Recd.

7. 1) దేవరకొండ నంగారుగ్రామనివాసులగు పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
2) వారి సోదరుడగు నడిచెరువు నర్సింహారెడ్డి మరియు
3) మర్రిపాడు గ్రామనివాసులగు వెంకటమోహనరెడ్డి మరియు
4) మేళ్లచెరువు గ్రామనివాసులగు వెంకటరెడ్డి మరియు
5) కనగల్లు గ్రామనివాసులగు వెంకటరెడ్డి మరియు
6) నంబరగట్టు విలాసగిరిధరగోపాలస్వామివారి దేవస్థానపు ధర్మకర్తలగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
7) నల్లగొండ జిల్లా దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
8) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
9) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
10) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
11) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
12) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
13) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
14) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
15) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
16) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
17) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
18) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
19) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు
20) దేవరకొండ తాలూకా కొండభీమనపల్లి గ్రామనివాసులగు
పట్టేలరుపాండుగడ్డ నాగిరెడ్డి మరియు

8) ఈ కార్యాలయంలో ఇప్పటికే ఉన్న వంశవృక్షాలలో ఈ వంశవృక్షం ఏ విధంగానూ పోలకపోవడం వల్ల ఈ వంశవృక్షం ఈ కార్యాలయంలో ఇప్పటి వరకు ఎవరూ సమర్పించలేదని నిర్ధారణ అయినది. కావున

[Jur 21]

No.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಪ್ರೀಮರ್ಸ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ ಮುದ್ರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದಾ

ನೀವು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಜೂಲೈ ಮಾಹೆ 22 ನೇ

ಮುಕ್ತಂ 341 ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಪರಾಂಬರಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.

By Order,

21/8/09

Secretary to Govt,

W. & Mines Department

GPB—1,000—18-6-06.

814

Muz.3] clear 7 90-07

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE. 814

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 2659 Cur

The accompanying Petition No. 1206

dated 9 9 1907 received at this Office from Krishnaiah of Gorei halli Grama in the Gubbi taluk re the Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at the place.

is forwarded, ~~together with~~ its ~~enclosures,~~ to the Dy Commissioner Tumkur Distt. for favor of enquiry and detailed report on all the allegations contained in the petition

4-12-07

By Order,

DH 5/12/07

BANGALORE, 6/12 1907

Secretary, Muzrai Department.

No 2660 Note To the Petr.

GP —1500—20-10 07

Ex. 515

190

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Dated 6th March 1907

Despatched 18

Received

General No. 477

Enclosure No. one file

Reporting on the petition of Krishnaiya of Dorehalli village, Gubbi Taluk, regarding the Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswami temple.

GOVERNMENT
3207
17.3.07
SECRETARIAT

Refer
to
Revenue Department
6/3/1907
Dft to draw
report

No

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

Dated 16th March 1908.

From.

K Doraswami Iyer Esq
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To L Ananthasami Rao. Esq B.a.
Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Mouzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No 2659 dated 6th December 07 Calling for a detailed report on the Petition of Krishnacya of Jonhalli Village in the Gubbi Taluk regarding the Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswami temple at that place, I have the honor to forward herewith in original a memo giving full facts of the case together with my order dated 22nd March 1907 thereon to the effect that the petitioner and his family have not had the Archakship for a long time, that during that period if

it was in Kunnaiya's family adversely
to Krishnaiya, although Krishnaiya stepped
that
into it in 1902–03 he left it subsequently
and Kunnaiya is again in the post
and that there is no reason to disturb
Kunnaiya.

2. The entire file of Vernacular
papers connected with the subject
and the petition received with the
above are herewith forwarded.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
K
For Deputy Commissioner

ADP

Muz. 1]

190

From

Dated

Despatched 14th April 1908

Received

General No. 4416.

No.

Enclosure No.

To

The Superintendent
of Inam Settlements
in Mysore

Has the honor to request to be furnished with an Extract of the detailed Inam register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands under title deed no. 804 dated 21st Septr 1870 for the up-keep of the temple of Narasimha Devaru and two others in the village

GPL—3,000—19-9-07

Village of Gobenahally 30

in the Kasaba & Gubbi

Taluk —

By order

Sd/) 30/3/08

Secretary.

- 30/3/08

Inam Superintendent's Office

Dated, Bangalore 21/22 April 1908

No. 125
Enc 1

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, Muzrai Department.

Sir,

As requested in your docket No. 4416 dated 14th April 1908, I have the honor to forward herewith an extract of the detailed Inam Register pertaining to the grant of Inam lands for the up-keep of the temples of Narasimha Devaru and two others in the Golenahalli village, late-Kadaba now Gubbi Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

D Rammanna

Superintendent of
Settlements in

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4283
23/4/08
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Register Sheet No 168

Taluk — late Kadaba now Gubbi

Hobli — Yedavanahally

Village — Golavanahally

34

Copy of the minor Register of Inams in the village of Golevahalli in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant Dry Wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Every where the local measures in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fraction in decimal
1	2	3	4	5
Title-deed No. 804	Devadaya	As per Pymaish of 1807 Dry No. 1 No 36	0-6-6	.4.20

Sammat of Yedevanahully in the Taluk of late Kadaba now Gubbi

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
Beriz Rs a p. 4 - 5 - 10		Granted for the Support of Narasimhadevaru in this Village. The Pagoda is said to be in good order and worship rendered	Jodi Rs ~~4 - 5 - 10~~ 2 · 5 · 3

in the District

DOCUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE INAM

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
Not Known	No

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poormah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
Not Known	In the Pymaish of 1807 Hammanta devar Dry - Placco 2 Candies 0 - 6 - 6 Jodi P 0 - 8 - 0.	In the Stala Dram account of 1844 Narasimha devaru Dry 0 - 4 - 0 Pagodas Beriz 1 - 5 - 0 Jodi 0 - 8 - 0 In the Pymaishy of 1849 Dry no: 1 0 - 3 - 4 do no 36 0 - 4 - 10 0 - 7 - 14

of the 38

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Golenahully. 1. Narasimhadevar and Hanumanthadevar 2. Bevinagodda Rangaswami Voreshipper Venkata			

Division

BRANCH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and communication by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
To be confirmed and continued So long as the object of the Grant is fulfilled. Jagz Rs 2-5-0 Sgnd/ B. Sopanah Spl: Asst. 5-7-70	Confirmed subject to a Quit rent of Rs 2-5-0 / Sgnd/ T. Clark. Inam Com^r. Sept^r 21-70
Inam Supdt's Office Bangalore 21st April 1908 compd GR.	"Copy" Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Gl

Endorsement granted to Krishniah of Dorchalla village in the Cuddapah District with reference to his petition registered no. 1206 of 9th Sept 1907 praying for his restoration to the Archakship of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Dorchalli

No 5210 dt 25.

In reply the petitioner is informed that ~~this is a case of Court have been passed to the effect~~ that this is a case of Srijani right and as such it has to be decided by a regular suit on the usual side

Mrs Ramaiah is
now in possession of
the Bijapur ~~the petitioner~~ the P.C.
~~(the petitioner)~~ should
file a regular suit before the Subdl.
the first instance
to establish his claim
if any.

By order
10/5/08.
Secretary.

Cir. order
No. 5211
Executive
W 9/5/08
Copy to the Dy.
Commr Dharwar Distt
with reference to his
letter no 477 dated 16th
March 1908.

(2) The vernacular
records are herewith
returned.

By order
Dy
Secretary
W